

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SAEID SAM KANGARLOU,

Plaintiff(s),

V.

ALTON AL LOCKLEAR, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:18-cv-02286-JAD-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 110]

Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion for an order that Plaintiff must appear for deposition. Docket No. 110. Plaintiff filed a response, indicating that he does not object to appearing for a deposition in the future. Docket No. 111 at 8; *see also id.* at 19.¹

Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to appear for deposition by September 27, 2023.

16 **FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THIS ORDER MAY RESULT IN THE IMPOSITION OF**
17 **SANCTIONS.** *E.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b). The parties must immediately confer on a date, time,
18 and place for the deposition. The deposition must be taken in person.²

Defendants' motion is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 25, 2023

Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Given Plaintiff's agreement to be deposed moving forward, the Court need not resolve the other issues raised by Plaintiff.

² Remote depositions are permitted when the parties stipulate or the Court so orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(4). Plaintiff has not agreed to a remote deposition and Defendants have not provided the showing necessary for an order requiring one. Even were Defendants to try to make such a showing in reply, moreover, the Court would not entertain that argument. See *Brand v. Kijakazi*, 575 F. Supp. 3d 1265, 1273 (D. Nev. 2021).